

C41  
XC2  
-1959  
B62

Government  
Publications

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-fourth Parliament

1959

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON

# BROADCASTING

Chairman: G. E. HALPENNY, Esq.

LIBRARY

★ JUN 2 1959 ★

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 4

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1959

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

### WITNESSES:

E. L. Bushnell, Acting President, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation;  
C. Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting; M. Ouimet, Deputy Controller  
of Broadcasting; and J. J. Trainor, Assistant to Director of Audience  
Research.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1969

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-fourth Parliament

1959

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON  
**BROADCASTING**

*Chairman: G. E. HALPENNY, Esq.*

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 4

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1959

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

WITNESSES:

E. L. Bushnell, Acting President, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation;  
C. Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting; M. Ouimet, Deputy Controller  
of Broadcasting; and J. J. Trainor, Assistant to Director of Audience  
Research.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING

*Chairman:* G. E. Halpenny, Esq.

*Vice-Chairman:* J. Flynn, Esq.

and Messrs.

Miss Aitken,  
R. A. Bell (*Carleton*),  
Tom Bell (*Saint John-  
Albert*),  
Brassard (*Lapointe*),  
Campeau,  
Chambers,  
Chown,  
Dorion,  
Fairfield,  
Fisher,  
Forgie,

Fortin,  
Horner (*Jasper-Edson*),  
Jung,  
Kucherepa,  
Lambert,  
Macquarrie,  
Mitchell,  
Morris,  
McCleave,  
McGrath,  
McIntosh,  
McQuillan,

Nowlan,  
Pickersgill,  
Pratt,  
Richard (*Ottawa East*),  
Robichaud,  
Rouleau,  
Simpson,  
Smith (*Calgary South*),  
Smith (*Simcoe North*),  
Tremblay.

J. E. O'Connor,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



CAI  
XC 2  
- 1959  
B65

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 19, 1959

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Halpenny, presided.

*Members present:* Miss Aitken, Messrs. R. A. Bell (*Carleton*), Tom Bell (*Saint John-Albert*), Campeau, Chambers, Dorion, Fairfield, Flynn, Forgie, Fortin, Halpenny, Horner (*Jasper-Edson*), Kucherepa, Lambert, Macquarrie, Mitchell, Morris, McCleave, McIntosh, Pickersgill, Pratt, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Robichaud, Rouleau, Simpson, Smith (*Calgary South*), Smith (*Simcoe North*), and Tremblay—28.

*In attendance:* Mr. E. L. Bushnell, Acting President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, assisted by Messrs. R. L. Dunsmore, Chairman, Finance Committee, Board of Directors; Charles Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting; Marcel Ouimet, Deputy Controller of Broadcasting; Marcel Carter, Controller of Management, Planning and Development; J. P. Gilmore, Controller of Operations; R. C. Fraser, Director of Public Relations; Barry MacDonald, Secretary, Board of Directors; J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary, Board of Directors; R. E. Keddy, Director of Organization; J. J. Trainor, Assistant to Director of Audience Research.

The Chairman observed the presence of quorum and read to the Committee a letter sent to Mr. Bushnell on May 15th conveying the decision of the Sub-committee on Agenda and Procedure on the question of the production of figures relating to program costs.

Mr. Jennings was called and elaborated on the statement he made before the Committee on Tuesday, May 12th, concerning "National Program Service" and outlined in particular program policies and standards.

Arising out of series of questions asked at a previous meeting, Mr. Bushnell tabled the following charts and summaries, copies of which were distributed to the members of the Committee and ordered printed as an appendix to the record of today's Proceedings: (*See Appendix "A"*)

1. Record Audience for Election Coverage 1958
2. Growth of Audiences—Canadian Produced Television Programs
3. Percentage of CBC Radio and Television Network Broadcasting—Sample Week Summer 1958
4. Percentage of CBC Radio and Television Network Broadcasting by Form of Communication—Sample Week Summer 1958

Mr. Trainor was questioned concerning audience size and audience reaction, sampling methods and analysis of audience trends done by the Corporation.

Mr. Jennings and Mr. Bushnell were further questioned concerning programming, and Mr. Ouimet gave information concerning news service, news commentary, and educational and school programs on the French language network.

*Agreed*,—That the arrangements be made in order that in future a French language reporter and translator be present at meetings of this Committee.

The questioning of Messrs. Bushnell and Jennings continuing, at 1.00 p.m. the Committee adjourned to meet again at 9.30 a.m. Thursday, May 21st, 1959.

J. E. O'Connor,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*

## EVIDENCE

TUESDAY, May 19, 1959  
11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum, gentlemen. You will recall that at our last meeting we decided that we would leave finance, because there were several reports that were requested, and go on to programming.

Following our meeting we had a subcommittee meeting, and the following letter was sent to Mr. Bushnell by the clerk of the committee, Mr. O'Connor:

OTTAWA, May 15, 1959

Dear Sir:

The chairman has instructed me to confirm that the following decision was taken at a meeting of the Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure of the Broadcasting Committee at its meeting this afternoon:

"Compile for presentation to the committee as soon as possible detailed production costs including administrative expenses for ten unspecified one-hour and half-hour 'a' time commercial television programs of a musical, dramatic or other nature, broadcast during the month of January, 1959, and relate total production cost to revenue recovered from sponsor in each case".

It is understood that such programs should be fair samples of day-to-day programming.

Yours sincerely,

J. E. O'Connor,  
Clerk of the Committee.

That was ten programs, made up of either half-hour or one-hour "A" time—that is, evening—commercial television programs of either a musical, dramatic or other nature. Mr. Bushnell, have you had time yet to prepare this?

Mr. E. L. BUSHNELL (*Acting President, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): I think we could, Mr. Chairman. We are in a position to give you that information today. Unfortunately, I was not able to get in touch with you, but I was going to suggest that the month of January was not, probably, the best month, because I would like to include in this report some of the commercial programs that are carried on the French network. Unfortunately, the month of January was not a typical month.

If you would prefer to have those figures, if you just leave it with me and have those figures changed for another month—let us say, November; I would hesitate to take December, either, because that is Christmas month—

The CHAIRMAN: Our reason for asking for the month of January was that we thought that was sufficiently in the past that you would have all your costs correlated. Perhaps you would like to let it go along as the subcommittee suggested, and then bring in the costs of two, three, four or five French shows at a later date.

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is quite all right.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable, gentlemen?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman—having asked for this information initially—that I believe it is pertinent to



have the French programs; but conceivably Mr. Bushnell could take as a selection, in addition to the ten we have asked for in January, a selection of a similar group for the last month that they were producing.

Mr. BUSHNELL: I think November would be a typical month: it is the beginning of the commercial season and we are well under way at that time.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): But I would prefer the committee make the selection of the month, rather than the C.B.C.

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is fine.

Mr. FORTIN: Am I right in understanding that these will be the only figures available to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: If, after you have heard the evidence from the witnesses on this, you are not satisfied that that is what you want, you will so indicate, and you will get the information that you require. But I would suggest that we try to understand this: that information will be given to us without the names of the shows; they will be identified, I would imagine, as "A", "B", "C", "D", et cetera; is that right?

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: If this is satisfactory, we are satisfied; if not, so move.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I also made that point to the steering committee, that this does not necessarily end the examination on the subject of costs; but it was felt we should first of all, make an assessment of the information we have acquired, and then decide what further information is necessary.

Mr. PRATT: I am a little puzzled as to exactly the reason for the great secrecy. It seems to me that where trade secrets are concerned, it is usually where there are questions of low-cost production, whereas we are dealing here with the secrets, more or less, of high-cost production. There is very little competition, I believe, from private stations on live television; is that right?

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is correct.

Mr. PRATT: Then where is the area of secrecy?

Mr. BUSHNELL: The area of secrecy, I think should be—if I may say so—reasonably plain. It is the secrecy between competitors in business, competitors in the motor car business, the soap business, the analgesic business—if you like—or any other business.

Mr. PRATT: That is what I thought: the competition is between commercial interests; the secrets are not the secrets of the C.B.C.?

Mr. BUSHNELL: No.

Mr. PRATT: It is the commercial secrets of competing firms that you are asking us to respect?

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is right.

Mr. FORTIN: Even if we do not have the price paid by the sponsor for a certain program, we would be interested to know—because I know that this is what people are interested in knowing—how much such a program costs. The idea of our asking this question is also to give a break to certain comedians, certain reporters, because the public hears that such a comedian gets \$50,000 a year. It is unbelievable. This special comedian needs to have his reputation watched. If it is true, people should know; if it is untrue, we must give this comedian—I will not mention the name—a break, and prove to the public that the figures they heard were just rumours, without any foundation whatsoever. That is the idea; it is not because we want to know what is going on, especially.

The CHAIRMAN: I realize that, Mr. Fortin.

Mr. PRATT: I think Mr. Fortin is using the word "comedian" in the French sense of "performer" or "actor"; am I right?

Mr. FORTIN: Yes, "performer".

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Pratt is an expert on that.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): You were never paid that much, John.

Mr. FORTIN: I was not pointing to anyone.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we go along with the shows that we asked for and then, at the end of the questioning, if you are not satisfied with the information we have, the subcommittee will meet again and we will figure out exactly the type of information that you might require. Do you have those ten unspecified one-hour and half-hour production costs, Mr. Bushnell?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to give a full statement on this now. I understood at the beginning that you would probably ask Mr. Jennings to start off. It is immaterial to me; I will do whatever you like.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is satisfactory to the committee, it is satisfactory to the chair. Is that agreed gentlemen?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jennings, will you read your statement.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): May I suggest, Mr. Chairman—and I am sorry to interrupt—that it would perhaps serve a useful purpose if the information that we have asked for were to be filed with the proceedings of today's meeting, so that we would have an opportunity of examining and studying it. Is that possible?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I am afraid it is not. Mr. Gilmore, I believe, is preparing the statement for us, and I notice him shaking his head. Therefore, he has not got the whole statement in the manner in which he would like to have it presented.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I understand then, Mr. Bushnell, that we are not only receiving a statement showing the relative costs, but we are also receiving a statement describing this, as a narrative of this information; is that correct?

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is correct. That will be ready by Thursday and will be presented at that time.

Mr. CHARLES JENNINGS (*Controller of Broadcasting, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): Mr. Chairman, at the first meeting of the committee a week ago today there was distributed a document which we called "The National Program Service", and I read to the committee the introduction to it which attempts to outline the objectives of the corporation. At that first meeting Mr. Pratt asked for clarification of the meanings of program policy and program standards as they appeared in the terms of reference of the program committee of the C.B.C. board of directors. At that time I gave him a very short definition, and today, if I may, I would like to start out by covering this ground of policies and standards in a rather wider way, inasmuch as they bear more strongly, I think, than any other factors on the output which we present. May I touch on policies first?

All our program policies are based on the primary conception of the C.B.C. as a public corporation, engaged in presenting a national service of radio and television broadcasting to the people of Canada. Here are the eight broad policies that spring from that conception, and I would like to comment on each of them as I go along.

First of all, significant tastes, interests and needs of the Canadian public should be served by C.B.C. programs. This policy, we think, is a natural expression of the fact that, as a public corporation, we are meant to serve all



Canadians. It also involves recognition of the fact that there is not one broadcasting audience, but many audiences, which have common tastes and interests and, at the same time, one individual with a variety of tastes might well be a member of several audiences.

What this means, of course, is that we try to set up a broadcasting schedule which contains a wide variety of subject matter. Naturally, in a mass medium such as television and radio, those interests which are common to the greatest number of people occupy a major place in the schedules, and that explains the predominance of entertainment programs generally.

Second, that comparable program service should be provided for the country's two main language groups. Our aim in this policy is to put out a comprehensive program service in both languages and, at the same time, to encourage as actively as possible, an interchange of ideas and programs between the two services to the advantage and, we hope, the enrichment of each.

Third, that broadcasting should acquaint Canadians with the history, traditions and culture of their country and should show people in one part how their fellow-Canadians in other parts live, work and play. We think of radio and television as instruments for national unity—of forces to increase understanding of our varied traditions and of our mutual problems. In a country where geography and economics are sometimes at variance with the development of nationhood, it is important to try to foster understanding and the vision of the unity that underlies our diversity.

Fourth, that the entertainment, artistic and cultural resources of Canada should be used to the fullest possible extent. In a sense, this is a two-sided policy. We try to exploit and develop Canadian talent as widely as possible; and, while we hope our audiences are being entertained by Canadian performers, we are at the same time fostering their development by giving them opportunity. And increased interest and support by the audience provides an opportunity for the growth of more talent which, in turn, will have a chance to perform. The mere fact that Canadian talent has a national platform upon which to perform, and that such performance receives financial and professional recognition, obviously encourages the development of talent and of artistic resources which might lie dormant without this incentive.

Fifth, that programs from other countries—which serve Canadian interests and needs—should be broadcast on the C.B.C. Because we live beside the United States, English-speaking Canadians, particularly, appreciate the value and interest of programs from outside the country. We try to find regular places in our schedule for programs from outside Canada. They give interest and variety, and the great American variety shows especially, are frequently on a scale which this country lacks the artistic or financial resources to produce here in comparable fashion.

Sixth, that such major institutions in our national life as the church and the school should be served with the assistance of advisory bodies representing those institutions. I think it is obvious that broadcasting should try to play as important a part as possible in both these fields, and we try to carry out our work here through national councils appointed for the purpose.

Seventh, that the area of news and public affairs, including political broadcasting, should be the subject of special safeguards designed to ensure that the public be as fully and fairly informed as possible. In news, in opinion broadcasting, and in political broadcasting the closest supervision is maintained always to ensure integrity and balance. Not only in the corporation's own internal rules and regulations, but in the corporation's white paper on Political and Controversial broadcasting have we tried to spell out the rules governing the application of these policies.

Eighth, that commercially sponsored programs should form part of the service. Commercial programs have been a feature of Canadian broadcasting from the very first. From the inception of the national service they have been recognized, not only as an important source of revenue, but many outstanding programs which Canadians wanted to hear were available on a commercial basis.

Mr. Chairman, having outlined those eight broad broadcasting policies, may I say a few words about standards? When I tried to give a brief definition to Mr. Pratt last week, I said policies were the things which guided us as to what to broadcast; standards were the things which guided us as to how to broadcast. Once you have decided upon doing something, immediately you are faced with the question of how you are going to do it; and in our case in broadcasting I think we can set out our standards under three main headings: artistic standards, standards of taste, and public affairs standards. I would like to say just a few words about each of these.

In the case of artistic standards, by their very nature they cannot be completely rigid; one man's meat may well be another man's poison. Subjective factors invariably play a part in them. But in matters such as speech, and in musical and dramatic performances, recognized and reasonably objective standards exist and can be applied. However, they will not be found written down in any handbook or manual.

In the C.B.C. we try to apply these standards by appointing people of proven ability so that they try to see that recognized standards—say, in the field of drama and music—are applied in the selection of singers, musicians, actors and other performers. We supplement these experts by using outside authorities as consultants and as adjudicators for auditions of talent.

Standards of taste and propriety apply to every area of broadcasting as they do to every area of life. There are accepted standards of good taste, good behaviour and good manners which come about through experience and common sense; and, while they may not be set down as a set of precise rules, a variety of directives issued from time to time as occasion arises exists.

When I mentioned policies in connection with news and opinion and political broadcasting, in a sense I touched on standards; but I would like briefly to amplify that now. These are standards of objectivity, balance and fairness which apply to news, controversial and public affairs programs; and these standards have been carefully developed to guide, not only C.B.C. staff, but outside and free-lance broadcasters on all such programs. These kinds of standards are easier to formulate than are artistic standards. Thus, talks and political broadcasting policy and standards generally are covered in our own internal rules and regulations, and by the white paper on political and controversial broadcasting. News, policy and style and taste are also dealt with, not only in the internal rules and regulations, but in such things as the radio-television style guide, the style guide for C.B.C. News Round-up and its French equivalent *La Revue de l'Actualité*.

The field of news commentary is governed by the same general standards that apply to the news itself. Our objectives are a full and fair analysis of news development, and an expression of all major shades of opinion about them. To achieve and maintain a balance in these programs, there is a continual and careful scrutiny within the corporation.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the remarks I wanted to make about policies and standards and the approach which we make to these things in both English and French and in radio and television.

There is one final thing I would like to say. Mr. Smith asked, at the session a week ago, for copies of surveys which would indicate trends in programs where we seem to be reaching our objectives. We are giving the clerk a set of three, which have been selected from a fairly wide list. These are



actually summaries of surveys. While they are rather lengthy, the full surveys are available. These three cover a survey indicating how audiences for certain programs have increased over a period of time; and while, again, these have been singled out, others can easily be made available. They also show a survey undertaken to learn something about hockey audiences, and a survey which gives in two charts, one a rather broad, and the other a more detailed breakdown for both radio and television, indicating how we try to reach our objective of giving as wide a service as possible to listeners, with a wide range of different programs.

The CHAIRMAN: May we have the permission of this committee to have those printed as an appendix?

Agreed.

Mr. PRATT: May I refer to the top of page 27 in the report, and a statement made by myself which probably ranks as one of the greatest political statements ever made, because, having read it, I doubt if anyone could criticize me one way or the other. What I was referring to was the last paragraph in the opening of the report on the national program service, in which one of the policies is definitely stated as being to integrate, so far as is possible, our two main cultures, of helping the two historic elements of the Canadian people to better mutual understanding and sympathy, and of drawing on the traditions of both for its programs.

My reference, while it was not a criticism, was that this policy could probably have better been brought to fruition by having one production centre in a large city such as Montreal, for both languages, rather than separating them into French production in Montreal and English production in Toronto, in a country the size of Canada which could well afford two large production centres. I hope I have made myself clear this time.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask the witness if he would be kind enough to provide us with a survey. It is possible he may have misunderstood me; he said, "a survey where it seems we are accomplishing our objective". That was not quite the intention of my question. I am not—for the benefit of the question—particularly interested in whether you are accomplishing that or not. What I want to find out is whether you are accomplishing the objectives; I do not just want a survey of those objectives you feel you have accomplished.

The second question is: are these surveys as such conducted purely by a department of the C.B.C., or have you had any surveys which were completed by any independent group who might analyse the problem for you?

Mr. JENNINGS: Except for what you might call some small internal surveys that we set up for one thing and another, all our surveys are conducted for us by independent, outside agencies.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I gather, then, that we could have this provided? If we selected an area you could provide a survey to determine whether the objectives which were outlined in your initial statement were being accomplished? For those we asked for, we could obtain an independent analysis of whether those objectives were being accomplished?

The reason I ask that is because—as the witness points out—of the difference in the standards of taste which are so wide, that this committee will never determine, of its own knowledge, whether a particular production is good or bad. It occurred to me that a survey of a particular area by an independent group would give some indication as to whether these objectives had been accomplished.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that would be a fairly difficult kind of survey to undertake. The surveys we do undertake with the three main people with whom



we work cover quantitative assessments, from which our audience research bureau attempts to read interpretations.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): May I be more specific? Do you, through any of the independent organizations, or other means, survey an area such as the city of Regina, or the province of Saskatchewan, to determine whether the type of productions which is being put on the network system is being generally accepted by those areas?

Mr. JENNINGS: May I ask Mr. Trainor, of our audience research bureau, to answer that question? I think he can answer it much more expertly than I can.

Mr. J. TRAINOR (*Assistant to Director of Audience Research Bureau, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): We have our internal surveys, but our audience study surveys are done once a month by International Surveys Limited, Elliott-Haynes Limited, and now by Neilsen's in some areas. These just give audience size, not reactions. From these, month by month, we try to analyze trends to see what is—

The CHAIRMAN: Does that not actually give you a picture of audience trends?

Mr. TRAINOR: Yes, it should. For instance, page 2 shows the growth of the audience on some different programs in February of last year, compared with January, February, and March of this year. It shows that the program is being accepted—at least, we assume it is—because it is getting larger audiences.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Regina, of course, is a poor instance.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Why is Regina a poor instance?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): You will understand, if you permit me to continue the question. Regina, of course, is a poor instance because there is no other choice for the Regina people than the one television network. In a city such as Toronto, do you conduct a survey with respect to the C.B.C. productions to see what the reaction is?

Mr. TRAINOR: Not a survey concerning reactions; but we are proposing to do one now in Toronto to see just what people feel about our Toronto station as compared with American competition.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): As a summary to my question: there is no survey that would provide the information I have actually asked for?

The CHAIRMAN: Except a survey for trends, audience trends, which we can get several places—either Elliott Haynes, or B.B.M., or your own research report. Is it a Gallup type of job you do in your own research department?

Mr. TRAINOR: No, just a sample, and everything is checked by a commercial research house. We take the data and analyze it each month and compare it to previous months, thereby getting the trend.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Mr. Jennings, when he was making his statement, said the C.B.C. tried to serve programs suitable for each significant interest group within the country, and when you are broadcasting—this relates to what the other Mr. Smith said just now—in an area, for instance, where there are commercial television and commercial radio stations, do you take into consideration in your programming what interest groups are being served by the commercial stations in the same area?

Mr. Charles JENNINGS (*Controller of Broadcasting, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): No, I cannot say we do, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): I was referring, for instance, to the amount of popular music that might be broadcast on your Toronto stations. Do you consider what service is being given by the private broadcasters?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I cannot say we do. What we try to put out is what you might call a balanced service; and what I meant when I said that is that we try to serve different audiences—like farmers' audiences at noon, and children's audiences in the afternoon.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): I realize that you generally take that into consideration. So, in one sense, you might be competing for the same type of program.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Mr. Jennings was speaking of balance, and he spoke, in his introduction the other day, of providing a service for those who perhaps were not in the majority in the matter of taste. This interests me a great deal, and I would like to know who figures out what is the balance. In other words, everyone is in agreement you should provide a certain amount of, let us say, lesser-known classical music; but who says how much?

Mr. JENNINGS: It is difficult to answer that question, Mr. Chambers. Any schedule for the moment is a sort of thing in being: a radio schedule is a thing in being; and our television schedule is a thing in being.

With our own planners we are in constant consultation and discussion with outside interests, through fan mail. In this kind of situation we discover whether a program seems to be successful, or we discover there may be needs and interests that should be filled. It is that sort of push-pull planning on a short range basis that goes on. I think it would be quite impossible to arrive at a schedule which was absolutely mathematically correct in the amount of each of its components.

Mr. CHAMBERS: I mean, is some estimate made through your research department, or through some other body, to establish the size of audience interest in each of these groups? For instance, it is a criticism heard that the C.B.C. itself has too much of what is described as lesser known works of little appreciated composers. Is this based on some knowledge on the part of the C.B.C., that there is an audience of a certain size for this type of music?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, it is. I do not know what you mean by little known works of little known composers. I do not think they occupy an enormous amount of time in our schedule. They occupy very little time, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): Mr. Chairman, I was a little disappointed in Mr. Jennings' statement on policy, in that on page 3 of the statement he says:

In the final analysis, broadcasting produces nothing tangible, no "end product", only an impact on the minds of listeners or viewers.

Here I come to what I think is probably one of the most important considerations broadcasting, particularly television broadcasting, has in Canada today. That is the impact on the mind of the viewer, particularly with regard to mental health. He says they have an advisory council from the churches and other organizations. What I would like to know is, do not you think an advisory council on mental health is important? Do not you have an advisory council on mental health? For example, do they have any advice with regard to patent medicines advertising, that is becoming so fantastic on television these days—that is, with regard not only to the products they sell, but the method by which they are trying to sell them? I mean, this business of showing a pill going down somebody's insides, and so on. It is, on occasion, very wrong, as far as mental health is concerned.

Here we have a medium with which we can do a great deal of good, or with which we can do a great deal of harm. We have various—

The CHAIRMAN: What is your question, Mr. Horner, please?

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): I want to know whether or not they have any mental health adviser, with regard to C.B.C. television in particular.



Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, quite definitely. We have been doing broadcasting in mental health on the radio for ten or twelve years, and from the very beginning.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): That is not my question.

Mr. JENNINGS: And the same thing on television.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): I want to know whether you have any mental health advisory committee which advises you with regard to the impact of other programs on the mental health of people generally?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, we have not.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): Do you not think that is an important factor?

Mr. McCLEAVE: That is left up to the producers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENNINGS: As far as the second part of your question is concerned: all this kind of advertising of medical goods, and so on, is approved by the Department of National Health and Welfare, as to its factual accuracy and, indeed, now I would imagine that factor is very much the affair of the board of broadcasting governors.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, to follow up that question, is it true that all the advertising, the scripts and so on, are looked at in advance? I think that is what you are trying to get at.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you mean the patent medicines?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS: This copy comes to us with the approved stamp from the department on it.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: From the Department of National Health and Welfare?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. I do not know what the bureau is.

The CHAIRMAN: Canada is different, then, from the United States on that?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not sure of the situation in the states: I do not know whether there is any control of this sort at all.

Mr. FAIRFIELD: Perhaps to establish and pin-point the independent surveys that are made, I wonder if we could have a breakdown of costs of the audience research bureau in the past year, to show payments to commercial firms outside the C.B.C. for independent surveys?

The CHAIRMAN: On the audience trend, or the complete survey which they might have taken?

Mr. FAIRFIELD: Any surveys they might have taken.

Mr. JENNINGS: Are you asking what we pay for commercial surveys?

The CHAIRMAN: The total dollar amount you might have paid to independent investigators.

Mr. FAIRFIELD: Or a trend examination, anything like that.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Again, I am afraid this is a situation somewhat similar to others I have mentioned. Actually, we deal with three of four firms, and I do not think they would want us to disclose the amount of money we pay to each.

Mr. FAIRFIELD: The total amount?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes, the total amount we can give, by all means.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, that could be done. Is that what you wanted Dr. Fairfield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD: That is, as compared with the audience research of the C.B.C.

Mr. LAMBERT: In this particular field of programming, are you now giving consideration to the philosophy of broadcasting and television known as block programming as against feature programming?



Mr. JENNINGS: Do you mean, say, on rock and roll?

Mr. LAMBERT: Block programming, where you have the same type of thing for two or three hours, where a man is in charge. There is one man in charge and he handles a period of, say, three hours, as against, say, having four or five people with a program of this and a program of that, and swing it into something entirely different?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think I see what you mean, when you talk about this kind of block programming. There are two examples of this on trans-canada radio now, Preview in the morning, and the other, Tempo, in the evening.

While it is a little block, in a sense, handled by one master of ceremonies, if you want to call it that—that is particularly so in the case of Tempo. But the intention is to supply a pretty wide variety of things like Rawhide,—Max Ferguson,—news and music. In the morning you have weather reports, band concerts and time signals.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Mr. Lambert was referring to a type of program such as C.B.C. Wednesday Night, people who are interested in more or less cultural programs?

The CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about television or radio?

Mr. LAMBERT: In the afternoons, where you go after teen-agers because they are at home?

Mr. JENNINGS: We say we are going after a great many people driving home in their cars.

Mr. LAMBERT: In the morning people consider they want something to jog them along a little bit. You do not have the sweet and schmaltzy music on in the morning.

Mr. JENNINGS: We do not. In the morning we find people want news, weather and time. These are the main things they want. The music we try to keep as brisk and bright as possible, as a sort of framework with it. In the case of Preview we have direct reports, which fall under the heading of news.

Mr. LAMBERT: Further to that, in view of the fact that private radio and television stations are going into this block programming, or are considering it, have you given any thought to consulting with them and seeing whether that is the trend?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it would be a pretty difficult thing for us to consult in any one area. We have as part of our service in this kind of thing, Preview and Tempo, and that goes right across whatever network is available at the moment; and part of this is local.

It would be an almost impossible task in each area to consult and try to plan your service, with three different private stations in a town. I think what we do is to try to keep a pretty close eye on our own service and make it as competitive as possible, within the general framework of policy as to the kind of service we put out; and we try to develop our audience as satisfactorily as possible.

Mr. LAMBERT: Does that go, even when the fact is you may be on the left foot when everybody else is on the right foot?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not quite certain what that means, but it does mean there may be an audience covered by a station with an opposite program, or a program which will not develop a big audience; but we put it on because we know there is an audience for it.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Jennings, I am not going to become involved in trying to assess whether program A is better than program B. It would be a great mistake, because of the diversification of opinion we have already had before us. But we have had many references made—in your

statement, in Mr. Bushnell's statement, and in the corporation's statement—on the question of Canadian content. The C.B.C., as I understand it, has set itself up as the champion of retaining a substantial Canadian content in their program which, I think, is all to the good provided it is not taken to the extreme.

Perhaps I might first of all ask what percentage of American programs you are importing?

The CHAIRMAN: The percentage in television or radio?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): In television.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would think the network percentage is, at the moment, 60 Canadian and 40 outside—and that would include American, and Great Britain. It would include outside stuff, about 60 per cent on television network being Canadian.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Has that altered since the Fowler Commission? Has it altered to the extent of those figures actually being reversed; and at that time were you on a 40-60 basis with the American programming?

Mr. JENNINGS: We have always tried not to go below 50; but the trend is, and what we are trying to do, is to increase always the Canadian amount of content in the schedule.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I believe the officials of your corporation have indicated you are concerned about the impact on the lives of young Canadians, in the event that this maintenance of Canadian content is not continued. I wonder if you would suggest that, perhaps, the lives of the children in Vancouver or Toronto, as an example—which see, perhaps, 80 per cent American content—are any different in their upbringing from the lives of the other Canadians who see purely Canadian content?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that is a long-term thing, and I could not answer specifically.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Do you ever think that perhaps the question of Canadian content—which admittedly is a good thing—becomes an obsession with the C.B.C. and we therefore get quantity rather than quality in Canadian content?

Mr. JENNINGS: I would say not, no. I do not think we become obsessed with the idea of doing things Canadian. I think we have a good deal of self-confidence in the fact we can produce good Canadian shows with Canadian talent.

Front Page Challenge on television networks is an example of a Canadian program which has started up in the last eighteen months, and it has been received enthusiastically.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I was not going to discuss specific programs, because I could name a few to which there has been no enthusiastic reaction.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think there is no doubt about that—and I could do that myself.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): You have made the statement you believe you are not overreaching in endeavouring to obtain a vast volume of Canadian content, and you are not sacrificing quality in many instances in these programs.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think you can overreach, so long as the material you put out is good.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): That is why I am interested in having these surveys, to determine whether public reaction was good.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Morris?



Mr. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman, has it been established how far we are permitted to go in the committee with reference to specific programs?

The CHAIRMAN: Would you repeat the question, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS: I wanted to know what the view of yourself and the committee was as to specific programs.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is very much like a buyer in a departmental store. I mean, a buyer may be right 60 per cent of the time. He certainly does not buy the things that he likes personally. Different ones in this room, on this committee, are going to dislike one, two, three, four or five different programs. I do not think we should consider our personal likes and dislikes. I think we have enough evidence available of the trend in radio and television so we can find what the majority or minority in Canada like. I do not think we should get involved in the discussion of a particular program, showing our personal likes or dislikes.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think Mr. Morris raised a very important question of order, on which I would like to make one very brief observation.

Surely there is not going to be in this committee, which is part of a free parliament, any restriction on the questions that are going to be asked. I can see some reasons why the president or the acting president of the C.B.C. would not wish to answer some of the questions, and he could give us reasons for that; but I should think we can ask any question we like.

The CHAIRMAN: By all means; I am suggesting that we could meet here for seven years if each one of us talked about individual programs and our likes and dislikes. We have the material available from all the different research bureaus, such as Elliott Haynes and B.B.M., or from the C.B.C. research department; and then I think we can talk about what the people of Canada like.

Mr. MORRIS: I do not think this is a matter of personal preference; it is not on that level. Perhaps we can put that question, and see.

The CHAIRMAN: Try it out for size.

Mr. MORRIS: I have in mind a program carried on the trans-Canada network, Hawaii Calls. Why is this being used for the propagandizing of the tourist industry in another country, when it could be used on a rotating basis for the tourist industry of this country? For instance, in this season it could be British Columbia Calls, Alberta Calls, Manitoba Calls. Then we could keep some of our tourists' money in our own nation.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Let me say that, I think that particular program is largely traditional; it has been there for twenty years. Furthermore, it is free; it does not cost anything.

Mr. MORRIS: Do you advance that explanation or argument for leaving it there or taking it off?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Not necessarily so; but I recognize the fact there is certainly an amount of propaganda in it. But, on the other hand, a lot of people like Hawaiian music, and they like it to come from the horse's mouth.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): We are back to the Calgary stampede again.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Do not get things mixed up. This is the other horse.

Mr. MORRIS: I am glad to know which end of the horse we get the program from.

My question, though, is—and I hope I am not violating good sense in this—not just the popularity of this program, but we are here talking about Canadian content. This program has been mentioned to me by really top-flight tourist promotion people, who say that at this time it contradicts other federal government activity in an effort to encourage Canadians to see their own country.